



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/814,226	03/21/2001	Takehide Miyazaki	FUJI 18.488	2007

26304 7590 06/16/2005

KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP
575 MADISON AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10022-2585

EXAMINER

SINGH, RAMNANDAN P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2646

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/814,226

Applicant(s)

MIYAZAKI ET AL.

Examiner

Ramnandan Singh

Art Unit

2644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on Jan. 03, 2005 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

2. On page 11, line 1, the applicant's recites "a **final Office Action** was mailed on October 5, 2004". This is in error. A **non-final Office Action** was mailed on October 05, 2004.

3. **Status of Claims**

Claims 1-13 are amended.

Claims 1-13 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 2, 7-8, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Scott et al [US 4,886,463].

Regarding claim 1, Scott et al teach a telecommunications apparatus, as shown in Figs. 3A, 3B, 3C, 4A, 4B, comprising:

a substantially box-shaped subrack having a back wiring board mounted with first connectors (i.e. male connectors) ;

a plurality of shell-type plug-in units (i.e. multi-shell connectors) configured to be inserted into the subrack so that a second connector (i.e. female connectors) of each of the plug-in units is connected to a corresponding one of the first connectors; and

a flexible, electrically conductive seal member (49) disposed between a lateral surface of the plug-in units that are inserted into the subrack and an interior portion of the subrack, the seal member being elastically deformed when a plug-in unit is inserted into the subrack and the second connector thereof is connected to the corresponding first connector so as to enclose both the first and second connectors to provide a shield

[Figs. 3A, 3B, 3C, 4A, 4B; col. 5, line 34 to col. 8, line 68; col. 2, lines 24-46].

Claims 8 and 13 are essentially similar to claim 1 and are rejected for the reasons stated above.

Claim 2 is essentially similar to claim 1 except for rectangular openings. Scott et al further teach the telecommunications apparatus having rectangular openings that accommodate and surround first connectors (i.e. male connectors) between adjacent panes [col. 7, lines 25-51].

Claim 7 is essentially similar to claim 2 and is rejected for the reasons stated above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

7. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scott et al as applied to claim 1.

Regarding claim 9, Scott et al further teach the telecommunications apparatus, wherein the seal member is made of a material selected from a group electrically

conductive rubber, and dispenser gaskets [Fig. 3A; col. 1, lines 11-20; col. 2, lines 12-17; col. 2, lines 30-35; col. 5, lines 55-66; col. 7, lines 3-24; col. 8, lines 12-31;].

Although Scott et al teach the multi-shell electrical connector apparatus comprising a highly conductive material such as rubber impregnated with silver coated copper beads [col. 9, lines 1-5; col. 9, lines 62-65], they do not teach expressly using conductive sponge and conductive plastic. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply any number of materials from a group consisting of conductive sponge, conductive plastic and others in order to prepare an electromagnetic interference seal [Scott et al; col. 9, lines 1-5].

8. Claims 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scott et al applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Jamet et al [US 5,266,053].

Regarding claim 3, Scott et al do not teach expressly the telecommunications apparatus, wherein: the openings in the frame member are oblong shaped.

Jamet et al teach a telecommunications apparatus shown in Fig. 4, wherein the openings (29) in the frame member are oblong shaped; and the seal member has a flange portion on a side of the seal member disposed opposite an inserted end of the plug-in unit, the flange portion entering an interior of the oblong opening [Fig. 4; col. 1, lines 56-64; col. 2, lines 4-18; col. 2, line 41 to col. 3, line 2; col. 4, lines 6-21; Abstract].

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide oblong openings with Scott et al in order to improve the quality of electrical connection between the plate and the housings of connectors [Jamet et al; col. 2, lines 37-39].

Regarding claim 4, Jamet et al further teach the telecommunications apparatus having lateral flanges 34 and 35, wherein the openings in the frame member are oblong shaped; the seal member has a flange portion on a side of the seal member disposed opposite an inserted end of the plug-in unit, the flange portion entering an

interior of the oblong opening; and a lateral surface of the plug-in unit that is inserted into the subrack and that surrounds the plug-in unit connector having an oblong banked portion tapered at a periphery thereof, the tapered surface of the oblong banked portion pressing the flange portion of the seal member, the seal member elastically deforming so as to conform to the tapered surface when the plug-in unit is mounted in the subrack [Fig. 4; col. 4, lines 6-64].

Regarding claims 5 and 6, the limitations are shown above.

9. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scott et al [US 4,886,463] in view of Siraty [US 4,743,080].

Regarding claim 10, Scott et al teach a telecommunications apparatus, as shown in Figs. 3A, 3B, 3C, 4A, 4B, comprising:

a substantially box-shaped subrack including a back wiring board having a surface mounted with first connectors (i.e. male connectors); and

a plurality of shell-type plug-in units (i.e. multi-shell connectors) inserted in the subrack so that a second connector (i.e. female connectors) of each of the plug-in units is connected to a corresponding one of the first connectors, the subrack further

including :

a substantially square metallic frame member;

a plurality of panes aligned within the frame so as to form substantially

rectangular openings that accommodate and surround each second connector between adjacent panes, the frame member being fixedly mounted on the surface of the back wiring board [col. 7, lines 25-51];

wherein each cover part is fitted into the frame member openings when the plug-in unit is inserted into the subrack so as to elastically deform the finger gasket, an elastic force of the elastically deformed finger gasket causes the electrically conductive cloth to contact the cover part along an entire outer peripheral surface of the cover part and provide a shield for the first and second connectors [Figs. 3A, 3B, 3C, 4A, 4B; col. 5, line 34 to col. 8, line 68; col. 2, lines 24-46].

Scott et al do not teach expressly a telecommunications apparatus having a seal member comprising a core spring member.

Siraty teaches a telecommunications apparatus having a seal member comprising a core spring member, a finger gasket that engages the core spring member and an electrically conductive cloth wrapped around the finger gasket [Fig. 6; col. 1, lines 51 to col. 2, line 60; col. 3, lines 43-66; col. 4, lines 25-40; col. 5, line 30 to col. 6, line 60; col. 7, line 48 to col. 8, line 49; Abstract].

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide an electrical connector of Siraty with Scott et al, which

Art Unit: 2644

permits easy connecting, demounting and reconnecting of two connectors and which is shielded with respect to EMI/EMP [col. 1, lines 19-46].

10. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scott et al [US 4,886,463] in view of Jamet et al [US 5,266,053].

Regarding claim 11, Scott et al teach a shell-type plug-in unit [col. 1, lines 7-10; col. 1, lines 35-42], comprising:

a metal casing, containing a printed board therein and configured to be inserted into a substantially box-shaped subrack having a back wiring board that is mounted with first connectors and a flexible electrically conductive seal member [col. 6, lines 35-51];

a second connector connect to a corresponding one of the first connectors when the metal casing is inserted into the subtrack [Fig. Figs. 3A-3C; col. 5, line 34 to col. 8, line 68].

Scott et al do not teach expressly the telecommunications apparatus, wherein: the openings in the frame member are oblong shaped.

Jamet et al teach a telecommunications apparatus shown in Fig. 4, wherein the openings (29) in the frame member are oblong shaped; and the seal member has a flange portion on a side of the seal member disposed opposite an inserted end of the

Art Unit: 2644

plug-in unit, the flange portion entering an interior of the oblong opening [Fig. 4; col. 1, lines 56-64; col. 2, lines 4-18; col. 2, line 41 to col. 3, line 2; col. 4, lines 6-21; Abstract].

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide oblong openings with Scott et al in order to improve the quality of electrical connection between the plate and the housings of connectors [Jamet et al; col. 2, lines 37-39].

11. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scott et al [US 4,886,463] in view of Mishriky et al [US 6,526,212 B1].

Regarding claim 12, Scott et al teach a shell-type plug-in unit [col. 1, lines 7-10; col. 1, lines 35-42], comprising:

a metal casing, containing a printed board therein and configured to be inserted into a substantially box-shaped subrack having a back wiring board that is mounted with first connectors [col. 6, lines 35-51];

a second connector configured to connect to a corresponding one of the first connectors when the metal casing is inserted into the subtrack [Fig. Figs. 3A-3C; col. 5, line 34 to col. 8, line 68].

Scott et al do not teach expressly an electrically conductive optical fiber seal member.

Mishriky et al teach an electrically conductive optical fiber seal member having a through-hole of a size capable of admitting an optical fiber and a slit that extends from an external unit to the through-hole,

wherein the optical fiber seal member being compressed after the optical fiber is passed through the slit and fitted in the through-hole so as to engage an opening formed on the metal casing of a size capable of admitting a plurality of optical fibers extending from a photoelectric conversion module mounted on the printed wiring board, to provide a shield with respect to the opening in the metal casing [Col. 2, lines 26-42; col. 2, line 65 to col. 3, line 15; col. 3, lines 25-45; col. 11, lines 39-57; col. 15, line 58 to col. 16, line 5; col. 16, lines 46-48].

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the electrically conductive optical fiber seal member of Mishriky et al with Scott et al in order for the electrical connection to function in harsh environmental conditions [Mishriky et al; col. 1, lines 21-30].

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Miska et al [US 5,646,369] teach EMI gaskets [Whole document].

13. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramnandan Singh whose telephone number is (571) 272-7529. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH (8:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tran Sinh can be reached on (571) 272-7564. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ramnandan Singh
Examiner
Art Unit 2644

A large, stylized handwritten signature in black ink, likely belonging to Ramnandan Singh, positioned to the right of his printed name.


SINH TRAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER